



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/033,860	12/20/2001	Francis Paul Abuto	17527	9233

23556 7590 08/29/2003

KIMBERLY-CLARK WORLDWIDE, INC.  
401 NORTH LAKE STREET  
NEENAH, WI 54956

EXAMINER
----------

TORRES VELAZQUEZ, NORCA LIZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

DATE MAILED: 08/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/033,860

Applicant(s)

ABUTO ET AL.

Examiner

Norca L. Torres-Velazquez

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## P r i d r Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disp sition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7/10/02  
6/24/03  
7/7/03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-10 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over KERAWALLA (WO 91/19036).

KERAWALLA discloses bonding non-woven fibrous structures comprising susceptible binder fibers of the sheath-core type with an EMR (electromagnetic radiation) susceptor. The fibers with the EMR susceptor become activated by EMR and act as a binder for the nonwoven fibrous structure. The reference teaches the use of conventional load-bearing fibers that are bonded by the susceptible binder fibers in the nonwoven structure. (Refer to page 4, second and third paragraphs and Page 8, lines 1-3)

The reference further teaches that the selection of the optimum load-bearing fiber depends on various considerations, including the intended use of the bonded structure, and further teaches the use of natural fibers, man-made fiber and inorganic fibers among the fibers that can be used in conjunction of a suitable binder fiber. (Refer to page 8 of the specification)

Art Unit: 1771

In one of the examples, for bonded batts, the reference teaches the use of 40% and 10% of binders. (Refer to page 15)

Although KERAWALLA does not explicitly teach the claimed oxidation property or the dielectric loss of claims 8-10, it is reasonable to presume that said properties are inherent to KERAWALLA's invention. Support for said presumption is found in the use of like materials (i.e. nonwoven web comprising binder fibers with EMR susceptors that are activated/heated by electromagnetic radiation). The burden is upon Applicant to prove otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald* 205 USPQ 594. In addition, the presently claimed properties of oxidation at the outer surface is 5 times higher than at the center, and the dielectric loss of the binder fibers would obviously have been present once the KERAWALLA product is provided. Note *In re Best*, 195 USPQ at 433, footnote 4 (CCPA 1977) as to the providing of this rejection made above under 35 USC 102.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KERAWALLA and further in view of GRINDRUP (US 5,786,785).

KERAWALLA discloses examples of EMR susceptors that may be incorporated into the fiber on page 14. However, the listed examples do not explicitly teach the use of carbon black, magnetite, silicon carbide or calcium chloride as claimed on claim 11.

Art Unit: 1771

The Examiner position is that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any of the claimed compositions as an EMR susceptor since these have similar properties to the compounds taught by KERAWALLA. Further, GINDRUP et al. teaches the use radiation absorbing material such as carbon, ferrites, magnetite, iron, nickel and cobalt in an electromagnetic radiation non-absorptive binder in order to produce an electromagnetic radiation absorptive composition. (Refer to claim 1)

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the binder fibers and provide them with EMR susceptors such as magnetite since the prior art has shown that these are equivalent materials to the susceptors taught by KERAWALLA and further with the motivation of providing the binder fibers with the capacity of absorbing electromagnetic radiation as disclosed by GINDRUP. (Paragraph 6, lines 14-15).

5. Claims 3 and 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KERAWALLA in view of GOLDMAN et al. (US 5,562,646).

With regards to the claimed nonwoven structure further comprising superabsorbent, it is noted that the use of superabsorbent materials in nonwovens for the purpose of using them in applications such as absorbent members for body fluids is well known in the art. The examiner provides the reference of GOLDMAN et al. to show support to the above statement. GOLDMAN et al. teaches absorbent members useful in the containment of body fluids in which at least one region containing hydrogel-forming absorbent polymer (superabsorbent). (Abstract) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of nonwoven materials to provide the nonwoven with superabsorbent composition or material for the purpose of providing the nonwoven with absorbing properties that could be used in the absorbent members for body fluids applications. (Refer to Abstract and claims of GOLDMAN et al.)

***Double Patenting***

6. Claims 1-4 and 8-24 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 and 8-29 of copending Application No. 10/034,021. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending application includes the limitations claimed in the present application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

PAUL (US 4,401,708)


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Norca L. Torres-Velazquez whose telephone number is 703-306-5714. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00-4:00 pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 703-308-2414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

NLT

August 20, 2003

  
TERREL MORRIS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700